

## **REMARKS**

### ***Summary of Changes Made***

By this Amendment, the subject matter of claim 2, indicated as allowable by the Examiner, has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to depend ultimately from claim 1. Claims 2, 6, and 9-11 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8 (6 claims) remain pending in the application. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Huang***

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. 5,439,628) (“Huang”).

The Examiner will note that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 2, with claim 3 depending from claim 1. Hence, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Inoue***

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al. (U.S. 5,254,617) (“Inoue”).

The Examiner will note that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 2, with claims 3 and 4 depending from claim 1. Claim 9 has been canceled. Hence, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Inoue/Ohkawa***

Next, the Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as obvious over Inoue in view of Ohkawa et al. (U.S. 4,098,752) (“Ohkawa”).

The Examiner will note that claim 5 depends from claim 1, which has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 2. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 5, and claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 6 and 11 have been canceled. Hence, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) - Rogers***

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rogers et al., U.S. 5,290,822, ("Rogers").

The Examiner will note that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 2, with claims 3 and 4 depending from claim 1. Claims 6 and 9 have been canceled. Hence, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Rogers/Davis***

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rogers (referencing Collins U.S. 4,323,458) in view of Davis et al., U.S. 4,333,974 ("Davis").

The Examiner will note that claim 10 has been canceled. Hence, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Nakazawa***

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated over Nakazawa et al., JP 56-005842.

In light of the incorporation of the subject matter of allowable claim 2 into claim 1, and the dependency of claim 3 on claim 1, it is believed that the rejection is moot.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 06-0625, our Order No. FER-15009.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK, L.L.P.



---

Kenneth A. Clark  
Reg. No. 32,119  
Christopher J. Korff  
Reg. No. 55,342

925 Euclid Avenue  
Suite 700  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1405  
(216) 566-9700